

REMARKS

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claim 1 to include the subject matter of claim 4, cancel claim 4, and amend claim 13 to correct its dependency. Thus, claims 1-3, 5-8, and 11-16 are pending in this application. No new matter is added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims at least in light of the following remarks.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 because the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for at least the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration because the amendments simply incorporate dependent claim 4 into deponent claim 1; (c) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (d) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Applicants thus respectfully request entry of the amendments.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Japanese Published Patent Application No. JP A 2000-337911 (Takeshi). However, this rejection has been rendered moot by the incorporation of claim 4 into claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 4, 5, 11-13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Takeshi in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002-0013815 (Obradovich). As claim 4 has been incorporated into claim 1, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection with respect to claims 1-3, 5, and 11-13, and 16.

Specifically, neither Takeshi nor Obradovich discloses, teaches, or suggests "a comparison unit that compares an address corresponding to the extracted telephone number with the extracted address to determine if they are consistent," as recited in claim 1.

Takeshi only discloses extracting a character string including an address and/or a telephone number of a facility displayed on a web page and searching for the position of the facility corresponding to the address or the telephone number (see paragraphs [0043]-[0044] and [0062]). When a telephone number is automatically extracted in Takeshi, an address associated with the extracted telephone number is not compared with the address examined from the web page to determine if they are consistent, as required by claim 1. Thus, if a plurality of telephone numbers is included on the web page (as is very common), according to the method of Takeshi, a telephone number, which does not correspond to the desired facility, may be automatically extracted and an incorrect position of the facility may be determined.

Obradovich fails to make up for this deficiency of Takeshi. Obradovich simply discloses that a facility may be searched for and that the search results may include an address or phone number (paragraphs [0040] and [0041]). Importantly, there is no disclosure that an address corresponding to telephone number extracted from a web page is compared with an address extracted from the web page to determine if they are consistent, as required by claim 1.

Because neither Takeshi nor Obradovich discloses, teaches or suggests "a comparison unit that compares an address corresponding to the extracted telephone number with the extracted address to determine if they are consistent," claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Takeshi and Obradovich. Further, claims 2, 3, 5, and 11-13, and 16 are patentable for at least the same reasons, as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 6-8, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Takeshi and Obradovich in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,790,974 (Tognazzini). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

This rejection is premised upon the presumption that Takeshi and Obradovich discloses or teaches all of the features of claim 1. Because, as discussed above, Takeshi and Obradovich fails to disclose or teaches all of the features of claim 1, the rejection is improper. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Applicants earnestly solicit favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,


James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jesse O. Collier
Registration No. 53,839

JAO:JOC/hs

Date: November 21, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--